DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 326 TM 800 603

TITLE Prekindergarten Program Product Evaluation Report: 1979-80.
INSTITUTION Saginaw Public Schools, Mich.
PUB DATE Jul 80
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; Cognitive Objectives; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Formative Evaluation; Language Acquisition; Parent Participation; *Preschool Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Psychomotor Objectives
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Michigan (Saginaw); *Piagetian Theory; Process Product Research

ABSTRACT

Evaluation of a Title I Prekindergarten Program serving thirteen elementary schools is presented. Through a screening test, children most needing prekindergarten experience were chosen for participation. The program followed the Piagetian theory of child development concentrating on the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains. Both process and product evaluations were conducted. The former concentrated on determining whether classroom activities matched those stated in the proposal, the roles of parents/aides in the classroom, and what efforts were made to remedy screening problems observed in the previous year. The product evaluation employed the Prekindergarten S.O.R.T. instrument to measure thirteen of the program's sixteen objectives. The Prekindergarten Program proved to be successful; in addition, the following recommendations are offered: (1) attention should be paid to the building level achievement data; (2) the Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research should monitor the screening process; (3) recruitment publicity should be increased; (4) a plan for a bilingual prekindergarten experience should be formulated; (5) the Title I Prekindergarten Supervisor Monitoring Instrument should continue to be used; and (6) the inservice program should be expanded. (GK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION SERVICES

- PROVIDING ASSESSMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH SERVICES -

Saginaw Public Schools

Saginaw, Michigan

PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM PRODUCT EVALUATION REPORT

1979-80

An Approved Report of the

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION AND PERSONNEL

Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research

Richard N. Claus
Statistical Analyst

Barry E. Quimper, Director
Evaluation, Testing & Research

Dr. Foster B. Gibbs, Superintendent and
Dr. Jerry R. Baker, Assistant Superintendent
for Administration and Personnel
School District of the City of Saginaw

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Claus

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

July, 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	1
INSERVICE EDUCATION	4
PUPIL SELECTION	6
PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION	8
Procedures for Process Evaluation	8
Procedures for Product Evaluation	9
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PROCESS DATA	9
Process Conclusions and Recommendations	20
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PRODUCT DATA: S.O.R.T.	23
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PRODUCT DATA: PARENT'S AS PARTNERS MONTHLY LOGS	33
SUMMARY	35
CONCLUSIONS	36
RECOMMENDATIONS	37
APPENDICES	40
Appendix A: Title I Prekindergarten Activity Observation Checklist 1979-80	41
Appendix B: Prekindergarten Process Evaluation Questionnaire 1979-80	49
Appendix C: Saginaw News Article About Title I Preschool Enrollment of August 27, 1979	52
Appendix D: 1979-80 Title I Prekindergarten Objectives	53
Appendix E: Prekindergarten Staff Development Inservice Agendas	55
Appendix F: Prekindergarten Inservice Evaluation Results for October 5 and November 12, 1979	57
Appendix G: Title I Prekindergarten Program Staff Inservice Evaluation Form	59
Appendix H: Percent of Students Attaining Mastery by Building and Objective	61
Appendix I: Memo To Reva Ruby Regarding Title I Preschoolers Who Participated in This Year's Program, But Were Not Screened	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	SUMMARY OF NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PUPILS (395 TESTED) ATTAINING OBJECTIVES ON THE PREKINDERGARTEN SORT COGNITIVE SUBTEST IN MAY, 1980 . .	26
2	SUMMARY OF NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PUPILS (395 TESTED) ATTAINING OBJECTIVES ON THE PREKINDERGARTEN SORT PSYCHOMOTOR SUBTEST IN MAY, 1980 .	28
3	A COMPARISON OF 1979-80 SORT OBJECTIVES WITH 1978-79 OBJECTIVES	29
4	AVERAGE NUMBER OF COGNITIVE AND PSYCHOMOTOR OBJECTIVES MASTERED BY PREKINDERGARTEN PUPILS BY SCHOOL ON PREKINDERGARTEN SORT, MAY, 1980 .	30
5	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENT OF PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT ON PREKINDERGARTEN SORT COGNITIVE SUBTEST BY SCHOOL	31
6	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENT OF PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT ON PREKINDERGARTEN SORT PSYCHOMOTOR SUBTEST BY SCHOOL	32
7	ATTAINMENT OF PRODUCT OBJECTIVES AS DETERMINED BY CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS OF SEPTEMBER TO MAY PARENT AS PARTNERS MONTHLY LOGS	34

Program Description

Saginaw's Prekindergarten Program, which has been in operation for the past eleven years, is funded through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is designed to provide four-year-olds with an environment that will enable them to develop skills needed for future success in school. The ultimate purpose of this program is to prepare inner city children, many of whom came from backgrounds that may not have equipped them with the skills necessary for success in school, for entry into kindergarten. After a year of prekindergarten, these children should at least be on a par with other four-year-olds as they enter kindergarten.

It is worth noting here that in September of 1977, the Prekindergarten Program was designated by the Michigan State Department of Education as a Demonstration Site in the Michigan Adoption Program. In order to achieve this distinction, it had to meet the Department's criteria for an exemplary program, including a comprehensive validation of its outcomes. What this means is that the Prekindergarten Program has proven so successful over the past several years that it is now recognized as a model program that can be adopted by local districts around the State of Michigan. Given the limited number of programs that attain this status, this is a notable achievement.

This year there were approximately 460 children enrolled at the program's thirteen sites: Baillie, Coulter, Emerson,

Haley, Heavenrich, Houghton, Jones, Longfellow, Loomis, Morley, Potter, Rouse and Salina. Due to shifts in enrollment patterns and/or space concerns, Haley Elementary went from half-day to day-long status and the center at Potter Elementary went from day-long to half-day sessions this year.

The Prekindergarten staff included a supervisor, thirteen certified early childhood teachers, thirteen teacher aides, a graphic arts aide and a secretary. With the exception of Potter and Salina (half-day sites), each school operated two sessions, one from 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. and another from 12:30 p.m. to 3:10 p.m. Class sizes ranged up to 20 children per half-day session.

The program's instructional approach closely follows many aspects of Piagetian Theory. Jean Piaget, one of the world's foremost child psychologists, spent years studying the development of young children. He found that all children pass through certain stages of intellectual development. Growth, according to Piaget, is a process of exploring, manipulating, adapting, and assimilating the environment, and the child goes through various stages in an attempt to integrate or organize what he or she has observed.

The most important point to be stressed is that Piagetian Theory offers ideas on <u>how</u> children should be taught, not <u>what</u> they should be taught. In keeping with Piaget's Theory, the Prekindergarten Program provides children with experiences appropriate to the developmental stage of each child. It is success-oriented. Instead of failing, children are supported,

led and encouraged to try new and different things. The rationale for this approach is explained by Dr. Millie Almy, professor of education, University of California, Berkeley:

> Piaget's Theory clearly carries the implication that the young child has as much, if not more, to learn from his own active encounters with his physical environment and from his exchanges with his peers as he has from the adult. But adults, parents, and teachers ... are constantly responsible for decisions that determine the nature of the child's encounters and exchanges.[1]

The idea is to make them feel good about themselves and about going to school. Teachers encourage the children to experience as many activities and aspects of the program as possible without fear of failure. Activities are centered around three domains: psychomotor (small muscle and large muscle body movement), affective (social, attitudinal and emotional), and cognitive (reasoning and knowledge). In prekindergarten the children are, in essence, learning to learn.

To the casual observer visiting a prekindergarten classroom the atmosphere at first glance might appear to be somehwat chaotic. There is, however, a definite structure to the program, although not in the traditional sense. Children are not seated at desks in nice, neat rows, working on similar tasks. They move about the room, doing different things, interacting with other children, the teacher and aide. The program has goals and objectives (see Appendix D) that children work on

---

[1]Almy, Millie, Young Children's Thinking, New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.

throughout the year. The structure of the program is in its planning and delivery system, which have been continually refined over the years.

Language development is an important ingredient in the program and teachers are encouraged to stress it daily. Many children come from environments that have placed little emphasis on verbal communication. As a result, they are often unable to express themselves well verbally. One of the major goals of the program is to surround the children with language while they are in the classroom in an attempt to increase both their vocabulary and self-confidence.

Another major goal is parent involvement. Each teacher is required to make at least one home visit to meet parents and to get an idea of each child's home situation. Parents are encouraged to come to class with their children and participate. All prekindergarten parents are urged to take an active role in the child's education. Materials are regularly sent home so that parents and children can work together on various activities. This was the second year that the parent program operated at all thirteen schools. The parent program was designed to teach parents to more effectively work with their children.

Inservice Education

Staff development through inservice sessions was a major thrust of this year's program because five of the 12 teachers were new to Title I Prekindergarten Program. Pre-service

sessions were held on September 20-21, 1979, and covered all the major points to get the program underway (see Appendix E for agendas). The inservice effort was planned to be evaluated by participating staff through the use of the Staff Inservice Evaluation Form (Appendix G). The chart below presents the dates and topics covered during the inservice sessions.

Date	Topic
October 5, 1979	• Classroom Management of Emotional Problems
November 2, 1979	• Development of Manipulative and Language Activities • Administering Prekindergarten S.O.R.T.
December 7, 1979	• Requirements of P.A. 116
January 11, 1980	• Gesell Screening Assessment: Philosophy, Developmental Cycle, and Demonstration • When Behavior Modification Doesn't Work
March 7, 1980	• Prekindergarten Performance Objectives
May 2, 1980	• Administering Prekindergarten S.O.R.T.

Detailed evaluation findings for the October 5 and November 2, 1979, sessions can be found in memo form in Appendix F. The remaining sessions lacked a formal evaluation by staff even though the program director had an adequate supply of such forms and the evaluator offered to re-design a new form to gather staff reactions to the inservice sessions. Thus data are lacking to

make a statement about the quality of these sessions. Still it seems evident from staff reactions and from attendance at one inservice that the quality of the inservice sessions could still be improved by better planning. As suggested last year, these sessions could be improved further if sound learning practices are followed in teaching teachers (e.g., statement of inservice objective(s) in behavioral terms, using factors affecting motivation, monitoring, providing for closure, etc.).

Pupil Selection

For the third consecutive year, a locally developed screening test with standardized directions was administered to children who registered for the program. The 27-item Preschool Screening Test developed jointly in 1975 by the prekindergarten staff and members of the Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research, was administered before school began in September. In 1977, members of the Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research further standardized the directions. Every year since a reliability study for internal consistency has been conducted on the scores for all pupils screened. The chart below presents the reliability study data for each of the years.

Year of Study	Number of Pupils Screened	Kuder Richardson 20 Reliability Coefficient
1977-78	466	.83
1978-79	495	.85
1979-80	506	.81

The results above show a consistent pattern and the reliability coefficient is strong enough to enable program administrators to make screening decisions on individual students. In addition, the test scores, as in years past, were found to be normally distributed.[2] So it appears from this study that the instrument is a valuable tool in screening children and can be used with a good degree of confidence.

The screening procedure is used to ensure that those children with the greatest need are chosen. A study was undertaken this year to determine if all incoming children are screened and if the most needy children are chosen to participate in the Prekindergarten Program.

The results of the study are disappointing. A total of 23 pupils who participated in this year's program were not screened at all. The names of the participating children lacking screening results by building are listed in Appendix I. Last year a total of 30 pupils who participated in the 1978-79 program were not screened at all.

Further it was found that the median cutting score was 21 raw score points for the 13 buildings with a range of 18 to 25. This seems like a high cutting score when the total possible raw score correct was 27. Another disturbing aspect of the screening result study was how consistently these cut off scores

---

[2]The complete results of the reliability studies are on file at the Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research and are available to anyone interested in examining them in more detail.

were applied at each building. The study was hampered by the following factors: lack of screening results on some participants and seemingly incomplete records on pupils who were screened and accepted for participation but failed to attend. With these cautions in mind, it was found that 45 low scoring children were not accepted for participation even though they received scores below the cutting score and many class rosters showed space for their participation second semester.

Procedures for Evaluation

Both process and product evaluations were required this year for the program. Each is discussed below.

Procedures for Process Evaluation. A process evaluation involves monitoring a program throughout the year to find out if it is being implemented as planned. This makes it possible to identify strengths and weaknesses that might affect a program's outcome. A process evaluation might include examining such areas as staff support, budgeting problems, strengths and weaknesses of materials, use of classroom aides, and whether the objectives are being followed.

For this program, the process evaluation was accomplished by four separate means: 1) on-site observations of all preschool classrooms, 2) a questionnaire to be completed by every prekindergarten teacher, 3) a log maintained by the supervisor, and 4) documentation from the program supervisor of publicity related to Prekindergarten Program.

Procedures for Product Evaluation. A product evaluation measures the end result of a particular program. The major question here is: Did the program attain the objectives it set out to accomplish?

The Saginaw Objective Referenced Test - Prekindergarten, included 31 items dealing with both psychomotor and cognitive program areas. The first 17 items measured the program's nine cognitive objectives while the remaining 14 dealt with the four fine and gross motor objectives.

For the second year the evaluation design required only a post-test. In years past, the pre-test had served to measure entry level skills, but with the use of present screening procedures it was thought to be no longer necessary.

It is important to note that Prekindergarten S.O.R.T. is not a paper and pencil test. It is administered somewhat unobtrusively as part of the daily activities so that the children are not always aware that they are being tested.

The other evaluation instrument is the Parents as Partners Sheet, on which each teacher records the amount and type of parent participation that occurred during the year (objectives 14-16).

Presentation and Analysis of Process Data

This year's process evaluation consisted of the following: a half-day observation by evaluators of every classroom teacher,

the results of a self-administered questionnaire about the general operation of the program, documentation from the program supervisor of publicity related to Prekindergarten Program, and a review of the supervisor's visitation logs related to process objectives.

The Observation Checklist (see Appendix A) was the instrument used for the half-day observations. The checklist dealt with the type of activities (processes) related directly to the product objectives and other key components of the Prekindergarten Program. All thirteen teachers were observed by one of three evaluators between February 18 to March 3, 1980.

The results of the first portion of The Observation Checklist, which was used in all thirteen classrooms, are presented below in chart form.

Type of Activity*	Number of Schools the Activity was Observed
Behavior Modification Techniques**	13 of 13
Interest Centers**	13 of 13
Gross Motor Coordination**	13 of 13
Eye-Hand Coordination (Gross and Fine Motor and Manipulative)**	13 of 13
Properties of Objectives; i.e., shape, color, hardness (five senses)	12 of 13
Rules of Behavior (school and traffic)	11 of 13
Social Knowledge (i.e., work roles)**	9 of 13
Grouping and Regrouping (i.e., classification)	9 of 13
Transitive Relations (i.e., length, height, weight, shades, hardness)	9 of 13
Conservation of Numbers by One-to-One Comparison (i.e., matching, pouring, getting coats, rearranging collections)	11 of 13
Topological Space (i.e., in-out, under, etc.)	10 of 13
Linear Order (i.e., straight lines, counting)	11 of 13
Parts of a Whole	13 of 13
Copying Specific Shapes (i.e., cutting, pantomime, drawing)	11 of 13
Temporal Ordering of Events	12 of 13
Use of Body to Represent an Object	10 of 13
Use of Objects to Represent Other Objects	10 of 13
Human Utterance Which Represent Objects	11 of 13
Use of Three-Dimensional Model to Represent Object	12 of 13
Two-Dimensional Representation of Objects in Drawing	9 of 13
Record of Parental Participation Being Maintained	13 of 13

*Refer to ESEA Title I Pre-School Examples of Pre-School Activities Sheet for a detailed explanation of the types of activities (see Appendix A).

**These activities plus some aspect of work on <u>physical knowledge</u> should be part of the <u>daily</u> classroom activity.

A review of the chart above indicates that the social knowledge activity was the only category scheduled on a daily basis that was not observed in all classrooms. A similar deficiency of not providing daily social knowledge activities

was also observed last year. It should be emphasized, however, that all other daily activities were observed.

The observation instrument contained four open-ended questions. The first two were answered based on the observation and the other two were answered by the teacher at the end of the observation. The accompanying observations/responses and their frequency are stated below.

1. If parents are in the classroom during your observation, what role(s) do they play?

   Based on the observation of thirteen classrooms, the following roles were played by adults in the four rooms where they were present:

   - Instructs at learning center. (3)
   - Prepares snack. (3)
   - Prepares and puts away learning materials. (2)
   - Disciplines misbehaving children by removing them from the group. (1)
   - Provides reinforcement of concepts learned. (1)
   - Participates in group activity. (1)
   - Acts as tutor. (1)
   - Helps with gym. (1)

2. Describe general tasks (e.g., maker of materials, tutor, teacher, etc.) that aides provide during the observation.

   Based on the observation of the thirteen classrooms, the following roles were played by aides in the thirteen rooms where they were present:

   - Instructs at learning center. (10)
   - Prepares snack and helps in clean up. (8)
   - Maker of materials. (7)
   - Acts as tutor. (6)
   - Talks to children about different subjects. (5)
   - Leads group activities. (2)
   - Obtains and puts away material. (2)
   - Disciplines misbehaving children by removing them from the group activity. (1)
   - Maintains records. (1)

3. What specific efforts, if any, were made this fall to screen larger numbers of possible preschool participants?

The remarks of twelve teachers that had screened participants made the following remarks.

- Used family cards in the office to determine families with preschoolers and then I called or wrote the parents. (7)
- Issue was definitely addressed at inservices and/or on an informal basis. (5)
- Established policy to continue screening through first semester. (2)
- Door-to-door effort was undertaken. (1)
- The late start due to the strike reduced the effort to screen. Last year, we went door-to-door. (1)

4. What specific efforts, if any, were made this fall to screen potential bilingual participants?

The remarks of the eleven teachers that had attended the screening inservice and screened preschoolers made the following remarks.

- No special effort was made for bilingual youngsters participation than any other group. (7)
- To the extent possible, bilingual preschool age children were sought out. (2)
- Sent letters to parents of bilingual parents, but many did not show up. (1)
- Used bilingual aide with bilingual kids. (1)
- Sent letters to parents but six to eight did not show up for screening. (1)
- Comments made about screening more bilingual youngsters both privately and at the inservice. (1)

The second means of obtaining data for this year's report was a self-administered questionnaire (see Appendix B) that was sent to each teacher on January 31, 1980. The instrument consisted of ten questions that provided information about the operation of the program. All twelve teachers under regular teacher contract (the thirteenth teacher was a substitute) responded to the questionnaire as of March 6, 1980. Their responses are given below by question.

1. Describe a typical daily classroom schedule for your pre-kindergarten program. More specifically, what major types of activities do you attempt to provide daily?

- Gross motor/gym. (12)
- Fine motor/preparing to leave time (lacing, zipping, etc.). (12)
- Language arts/Peabody Language Kits. (12)
- Learning center time. (8)
- Stories/flannel board/tape and record listening time. (8)
- Finger plays. (6)
- Snack time. (6)
- Social studies/roles. (5)
- Free expression time/play. (6)
- Greeting children/coats, etc. (3)
- Self concept/affective. (3)
- Art. (3)
- The following were mentioned by just two respondents: dramatization, science, bathroom time, library time, seriation, and representation at the symbol level.
- The following were mentioned by just one respondent: parent participation, creativity, critical thinking, individual work jobs, classification, structuring of space/time, specific concepts, color identification, and theme.

2. Describe how you use "behavior modification" techniques in your classroom. What specific behaviors are you trying to change through these techniques?

<u>What behavior modification techniques used?</u>

- Rewards to point out desirable behaviors. (11)
- Extinction/ignore inappropriate behavior. (4)
- Time-out. (2)
- The remaining techniques were pointed out by just one respondent: intermittent reinforcement; pre-mack principle; signal learning (xylophone); and commenting on behavior and not child.

<u>What specific behaviors are you trying to change?</u>

- Aggressive acts. (4)
- Inappropriate classroom behavior/not following rules. (3)
- Not listening quietly to a story. (3)
- Shyness. (2)
- Yelling. (2)
- Unaccepted behaviors/undesirable behavior. (2)
- The remaining behaviors were pointed out by just one respondent and the following represents a sample of these responses: not sharing; temper tantrums; running; not showing concern for others, etc.

3. Do you presently have a Peabody Kit to use in your classroom?

Yes 100% (12)
No 0% (0)

If so, how do you use it?

- Introduce new concepts and/or enrich concepts already introduced. (7)
- Puppets, records, and story posters for stories, conversation starters, and language development. (7)
- Color chips and magnetic shapes for fine motor; big versus small shapes; colors, and/or same and different. (5)
- Picture cards to teach community helpers; animals; fruits; vegetables; and/or boys/girls clothing. (3)
- Use lessons as described (at least twice weekly) to supplement objectives I'm teaching. (2)
- Use activities at the beginning of the day with emphasis on listening, thinking, talking, understanding, and speech/verbal relationship through highly motivating activities. (2)
- Correlate these materials with prekindergarten objectives. (1)
- Manikin in kit used for body parts, prepositions, and adjectives. (1)

4. What steps, if any, have you taken to provide for language development in your classroom?

- Puppets and finger plays. (8)
- Dramatization/role playing. (7)
- Stories/plot extension/nursery rhymes. (7)
- Peabody Language Kit. (5)
- Creative writing and story writing and/or stories based on posters/pictures. (5)
- Many ideas. (5)
- Choral speaking and singing. (4)
- Encourage and reinforce language in group or individual setting. (4)
- Show/tell and current events. (3)
- Observation of many experiences. (3)
- Classification. (2)
- Books or Bill Martin's books/tapes. (2)
- The following activities were mentioned by one respondent: discussions about material objects are made from, asking open-ended questions, labelling, hypothesizing, socializing, and oral/expressive language.

5. Are you presently lacking basic instructional materials and/or equipment to operate the prekindergarten program?

Yes 25% (3)
No 75% (9)

Open-ended comments of the three "yes" respondents are given below.

- Space. (1)
- Replace old materials (i.e., missing puzzle pieces, Fisher Price materials, etc.). (1)
- No equipment or material identified. (1)

6. How many times has the program supervisor observed your classroom this school year?

- The number of times the supervisor observed in the classroom varied a good deal. Two teachers cited 8 visits; one, 5 or 6 visits; one, 5 visits; three, 4 visits; one, 3 visits; one, 2 visits; and three teachers indicated many times.

7. In which areas do you feel you need more training?

- Materials development. (5)
- Practical application of Piaget in the classroom. (2)
- No response/none. (2)
- Piaget theory. (1)
- Expressive language techniques. (1)
- Peabody Kit. (1)
- New teaching techniques. (1)
- New psychological theories. (1)
- Sharing of new children's books and films. (1)
- Planning for activities. (1)
- How to effectively carry out paperwork. (1)
- New ideas generally. (1)

8. What steps, if any, could be taken to improve the inservice sessions?

- None. (4)
- Meetings have been very boring, not useful, repetitious, and a waste of money. (3)
- Separate meetings should be held for old and new staff members to make them more relevant to both groups. (2)
- Teachers need to be more cooperative in sharing new things tried. (2)
- Active inservice committee needs to be formed to get bank of suggestions going. (1)
- Aides also need inservice training. (1)

9. What steps, if any, could be taken to improve the parenting component?

- None. (8)
- Parenting book needs to be revised because the projects take too long to prepare and/or cost too much. (2)
- Minority administrator is needed to relate to parents. (1)
- Continued practice is needed to deal with parents. (1)
- Sharing ideas that work. (1)

10. What other comments and concerns do you have regarding this year's prekindergarten program?

- None, excellent program. (6)
- Too much staff turnover. (2)
- Buddy staff member system (veteran teacher help to new teacher) has not worked out. (1)
- What role should the aide be playing in the classroom. (1)
- Our program lost two competent staff members this year. I don't understand why the administration did not replace these people with teachers that have a ZA endorsement. (1)
- This program is unique because of the genuine cooperation and concern shown by the staff. (1)
- Fridays are important because of the time they allow us to make materials, phone calls, etc. (1)
- More money for materials/snacks. (1)

The program supervisor was the source of data for two other aspects of the process evaluation. The first aspect dealt with providing documentation that an extensive publicity campaign for prekindergarten recruitment was undertaken. A Michigan Department of Education memorandum to Jean Grey, Director of Compensatory Education, dated May 22, 1979, states the following need for such an undertaking: "Recruiting and screening for eligibility in the prekindergarten component should be expanded to cover more of the potential four-year-olds

in the Title I project areas and special provisions (curriculum/staff) should be made for bilingual students enrolled in this component." Early in the project year the program supervisor agreed to send material to document that the publicity effort was undertaken. As of March 11, 1980, no such material was received from the program supervisor. The Saginaw News did carry a small article about the program and recruitment campaign on August 27, 1979 (see Appendix C). The responses of classroom teachers to questions 3 and 4 of The Observation Checklist reviewed earlier indicates that these teachers did little if anything beyond the procedures employed in past years to recruit additional potential prekindergarten pupils. A comparison of the number of applicants screened for approximately the same number of participant slots revealed that 495 applicants were screened last year compared with 505 applicants this year. A teacher strike did delay the opening of school this year, but a more extensive recruitment campaign still was possible.

The second aspect of the process evaluation was an analysis of the supervisor's classroom visitation logs. As of the second week of March, 1980, the logs for October through February had been submitted. An analysis of the logs revealed the following statistical information about the visitation: on the average, approximately some portion of 9 days per month was spent in visitations (ranged from 8 to 11 days); on the average, approximately 2 schools were visited per day (ranged from 1 school to

7 schools per day); and, on the average, each school had been visited approximately 7 times over the 5 month period (ranged from 5 to 11 times). The list below captures the frequency and nature of activities conducted by the supervisor during the 95 classroom visitations.

- Observed classroom/teacher. (19)
- Visited parent meeting. (13)
- Checked on compliance related to PA 116, pick-up problems and other Department of Social Services requirements (13)
- Discussed CMU student placement/observed CMU student. (12)
- Talked to classroom teacher/substitute. (7)
- Worked with disruptive child. (7)
- Checked physical setting/large motor equipment. (6)
- Escorted out-of-town visitors. (6)
- Public relations visit. (4)
- Made recommendations about grouping/story hour seating arrangement. (3)
- Delivered food or made recommendations about lunch. (3)
- Explained budget. (2)
- Delivered materials. (2)
- The following activities were only mentioned once in the log: reviewed lesson plan and made recommendation it needs to be more specific; talked with aide; discussed with teacher about possible visit to state meeting; worked as aide; discussed with teacher possibility of sharing materials; discussed with teacher about brown bear pictures; and talked with aide, teacher, and principal about the existing communication problem.

The supervisor's log was intended to document the nature and extent that technical assistance and counseling for implementation of the proposed instructional program as stated in process objective did take place. The above list of activities does show that the program supervisor was out at the program

sites, but the list fails to document what the program supervisor did to improve the delivery of classroom activities. Log entries like the following: talked to classroom teacher/substitute, observed classroom teacher, visited parent meeting, etc., provide little insight into how these talks, visits, and observations brought classroom activities more in line with program objectives. A more insightful log or the use of a supervisor's monitoring instrument could be used to document the need for certain inservice sessions, provide insight as to why certain objectives were or were not mastered, and give an insight into the ability level of new staff members. It should be noted that the supervisor's logs turned in this year are improved over last year, but there is still room for improvement.

Process Conclusions and Recommendations. On March 17, 1980, a midyear process evaluation feedback session was held with the Director of Compensatory Education, Director of Program Evaluation, Supervisor of Preschool Education, and the Program Evaluator. During the session the results of observations of teachers, questionnaire findings, and logs/memos of the Preschool Supervisor were reviewed with an eye toward strengths and weaknesses in the present operation of the program.

The point-by-point review of the process data by the participants found the following strong points: teacher activities, both observed and reported, were almost a perfect match to those proposed; parents and aides were observed in a large number of

varied educational roles; teachers displayed a large repertory of activities related to language development; teachers showed an increased knowledge of behavior modification techniques and a variety of target behaviors that these techniques were being used to modify; and most teachers viewed the parenting program as workable and a positive asset. All involved in this review of findings thought these strengths were especially noteworthy due to the large number of first year staff members (five of thirteen) to such a complex and varied curricular program.

The following areas were discussed with an eye toward improving them: recruiting more potential participants so that the most needy prekindergarten aged pupils could be placed in the program (state mandated recommendation); providing a bilingual preschool experience where student populations warrant (state mandated recommendation); carrying out inservice sessions somewhat differently so that both new and old staff members benefit from them; editing the program proposal so that social knowledge activities are no longer a daily activity but provided on an intermittent basis later in the program year; replacing some missing or broken educational materials; and, possibly providing inservice for the aides. From this discussion the following mutually agreed upon recommendations for implementation during remainder of this year and into 1980-81 school year resulted:

1. An increased publicity effort for recruitment and screening of preschoolers, both this spring and next fall. Documentation of these efforts should be provided to the Evaluation Department so that the questions raised by the State Department of Education can be answered effectively.

2. The Director of Compensatory Education, the Supervisor of Preschool Education, and the Director of Bilingual Education will meet together to formulate a plan to provide a prekindergarten experience for needy bilingual preschoolers and to use the Office of Bilingual Education as an aid in the publicity for recruitment of all preschoolers in the target area.

3. The Supervisor of Preschool Education should meet with the Director of Federal Programs to revise the prekindergarten proposal so that social knowledge activities (social roles) are no longer described as a daily activity but rather as it is employed in the present program.

4. The Supervisor of Preschool Education will use the Title I Prekindergarten Supervisor Monitoring Instrument for the remainder of the school year at least once at each program site. This trial use will provide experiences with the instrument to revise it if needed. Next year it will provide the documentation for the process objective related to the supervisor's role of providing technical assistance and counseling for implementation of the proposed instructional program.

5. The Supervisor of Preschool Education should seek some means to build upon the present inservice program, like meeting with another party such as the Director of Compensatory Education to formulate new strategies to replace the inactive buddy system and teacher inservice committee. These new plans should note teacher suggestions mentioned in the present process data such as the following: provide more opportunities to make materials during inservice; give knowledge that will be helpful to new and old staff members (either separately or together); show practical applications of Piaget in the classroom; possibly provide inservices for aides separately; etc. It is important to note that inservice sessions over important curricular concerns of program objectives and behavior modification techniques have been carried out.

Presentation and Analysis of Product Data: S.O.R.T.

For 1979-80, the program attained 11 of the 13 objectives measured by the Prekindergarten S.O.R.T. instrument. This 85 percent achievement figure, based on 395 pupils who were tested in May, represents an increase of approximately eight percent over last year's results. On the cognitive subtest, the pupils attained seven of nine objectives (see Table 1), while on the psychomotor subtest, all four objectives were attained (see Table 2).

A clearer perspective might be gained by looking at the data in Table 3, which compares this year's results with last year's results. The level of attainment decreased on five of the sixteen objectives. Achievement dropped anywhere from one percent to seven percent. The level of attainment increased from one to eleven percent on seven objectives. On objective twelve (representation at the symbol level), a sizable increase of eleven percent occurred. Overall it appears the program has shown a slight upward improvement.

The results on objectives 6-9, which measure expressive language, also deserve mention. This is the third year that the pupils have been tested in this skill area. Last year was the first year when all four expressive language objectives were tested. Three of the four objectives showed slight to moderate percent of decrease in level of pupils attaining the standard. The remaining objective (number 7 - sentence usage of 5 words or more) showed the same level of pupil attainment.

This year, for the third time, objective mastery data are reported by school. Table 4 presents the average number of cognitive and psychomotor objectives mastered by the pupils at each of the thirteen schools. Tables 5 and 6 show the frequency distribution of objective attainment by school.

Given the general staff turmoil during the year (a teacher strike as the program year started, five new teachers started the program in September, and one half-day center lost its teacher at about midyear), the results by school should be approached with a certain amount of caution by the reader.

The variations in achievement by school seem predictable given the situation. In Table 4, for instance, the data show that the average number of cognitive objectives mastered ranged from highs of 8.48 at Coulter and 8.32 at Houghton (out of a possible 9) to lows of 6.53 at J. Rouse and 6.75 at Longfellow. A similar range can be noted on the psychomotor objectives, from 3.78 (out of a possible 4) at Houghton to 2.59 at Emerson. Hopefully in years hence this variation between program sites can be reduced.

The percentage of pupils achieving at least 7 of the 9 cognitive objectives (see Table 5) revealed a similar pattern of variations as above, from a high of 89.2% at Houghton to a low of 52.6% at J. Rouse. At six of the thirteen program sites fewer than 70 percent of the pupils did attain at least 7 of the 9 objectives. This represents a decrease from the 1978-79 school year when there were three schools in which less than

70 percent of the pupils mastered at least 7 of the cognitive objectives.

On the four psychomotor objectives (see Table 6), the achievement range was slightly greater. At Houghton, a high of 100 percent of the pupils attained at least three of the four objectives, while 55.6 percent of the Jones pupils reached that level, which was the lowest. At three of the thirteen program sites, fewer than 70 percent of the pupils did attain at least 3 of the 4 objectives. This represents a slight increase from the 1978-79 school year when there were four schools in which less than 70 percent of the pupils mastered at least 3 of the psychomotor objectives.

The reader is encouraged to examine closely all the S.O.R.T. achievement data presented in Tables 1-6.

Using the 1978-79 S.O.R.T. results as a benchmark, an improvement can be noted in this year's achievement results. However, additional emphasis seems to be necessary in sentences (objective 7) and fluency (objective 8) of expressive language.

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PUPILS (395 TESTED) ATTAINING OBJECTIVES ON THE PREKINDERGARTEN SORT COGNITIVE SUBTEST IN MAY, 1980.

Obj. No.	Objective Description	Standard	Pupils Attaining Standard #	Pupils Attaining Standard %	Attainment of Objective
1	Physical knowledge	80% of the pupils will answer correctly 2 of 3 items	371	93.9	Yes
2	Social knowledge	80% of the pupils will answer correctly 3 of 4 items	366	92.7	Yes
3	Knowledge: Classification	50% of the pupils will successfully apply two criteria for sorting	294	74.4	Yes
4	Knowledge: Seriation	70% of the pupils will answer correctly 1 of 2 items	304	77.0	Yes
5	Knowledge: Structuring of Time	50% of the pupils will answer correctly 1 of 2 items	326	82.5	Yes

Continued

TABLE 1. CONTINUED

Obj. No.	Objective Description	Standard	Pupils Attaining Standard #	Pupils Attaining Standard %	Attainment of Objective
6	Expressing Language: Labeling	85% of the pupils will name at least 4 objects in response to the item	371	93.9	Yes
7	Expressive Language: Sentence	80% of the pupils will use a sentence of 5 or more words to tell a story	300	75.9	No
8	Expressive Language: Fluency	65% of the pupils will use at least 3 of 5 elements of fluency	194	49.1	No
9	Expressive Language: Plot Extension	50% of the pupils will use at least one element of plot extension	330	83.5	Yes

TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PUPILS (395 TESTED) ATTAINING OBJECTIVES ON THE PREKINDERGARTEN SORT PSYCHOMOTOR SUBTEST IN MAY, 1980.

Obj. No.	Objective Description	Standard	Pupils Attaining Standard #	Pupils Attaining Standard %	Attainment of Objective
10	Fine motor coordination	80% of the pupils will complete successfully 75% of the items	355	89.9	Yes
11	Structuring of space	65% of the pupils will correctly answer both items	293	74.2	Yes
12	Representation at the symbol level	65% of the pupils will copy successfully 3 of 4 shapes	257	65.1	Yes
13	Gross motor coordination	80% of the pupils will successfully complete 3 of 4 items	368	93.2	Yes

TABLE 3. A COMPARISON OF 1979-80 SORT OBJECTIVES WITH 1978-79 OBJECTIVES.

Objective Number	Achievement Standard for Objective Mastery	Pupils Attaining Standard		
		1979-80	1978-79	Difference
1	2 of 3 items	94%	91%	+ 3%
2	3 of 4 items	93%	92%	+ 1%
3	2 of 2 items	74%	70%	+ 4%
4	1 of 2 items	77%	84%	- 7%
5	1 of 2 items	82%	78%	+ 4%
6	$\geq$ 4 objects named	94%	95%	- 1%
7	1 of 1 item	76%	76%	0%
8	3 of 5 items	49%	56%	- 7%
9	$\geq$ 1 element	84%	85%	- 1%
10	3 of 4 items	90%	87%	+ 3%
11	2 of 2 items	74%	75%	- 1%
12	3 of 4 items	65%	54%	+ 11%
13	3 of 4 items	93%	91%	+ 2%

TABLE 4. AVERAGE NUMBER OF COGNITIVE AND PSYCHOMOTOR OBJECTIVES MASTERED BY PREKINDERGARTEN PUPILS BY SCHOOL ON PREKINDERGARTEN SORT, MAY, 1980.

School	Number	Cognitive*	Psychomotor**
Baillie	25	7.00	3.08
Coulter	31	8.48	3.74
Emerson	32	7.13	2.59
Haley	34	6.97	2.74
Heavenrich	31	6.94	3.35
Houghton	37	8.32	3.78
Jones	35	7.14	3.54
Longfellow	36	6.75	3.08
Loomis	35	7.00	3.26
Morley	26	7.58	3.31
Potter	17	7.06	3.65
Rouse	38	6.53	3.11
Salina	18	7.11	2.67

*9.0 possible objectives.
**4.0 possible objectives.

TABLE 5. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENT OF PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT ON PREKINDERGARTEN SORT COGNITIVE SUBTEST BY SCHOOL.

School	Number of Objectives Mastered					
	7-9	6	4-5	2-3	1	0
Baillie	64.0	24.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Coulter	96.8	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Emerson	68.8	21.9	9.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Haley	70.6	17.6	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Heavenrich	77.4	9.7	9.7	0.0	3.2	0.0
Houghton	89.2	10.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jones	68.6	14.3	17.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Longfellow	52.8	22.2	19.4	5.6	0.0	0.0
Loomis	68.6	14.3	8.6	8.6	0.0	0.0
Morley	76.9	7.7	11.5	0.0	3.8	0.0
Potter	64.7	5.9	29.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rouse	52.6	23.7	15.8	7.9	0.0	0.0
Salina	77.8	11.1	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0

TABLE 6. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENT OF PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT ON PREKINDERGARTEN SORT PSYCHOMOTOR SUBTEST BY SCHOOL.

School	Number of Objectives Mastered			
	4-3	2	1	0
Baillie	84.0	8.0	4.0	4.0
Coulter	93.5	6.5	0.0	0.0
Emerson	59.4	21.9	18.8	0.0
Haley	64.7	26.5	5.9	2.9
Heavenrich	87.1	9.7	3.2	0.0
Houghton	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jones	91.4	8.6	0.0	0.0
Longfellow	80.6	13.9	5.6	0.0
Loomis	82.9	8.6	8.6	0.0
Morley	80.8	15.4	0.0	3.8
Potter	94.1	0.0	5.9	0.0
Rouse	76.3	15.8	7.9	0.0
Salina	55.6	22.2	22.2	0.0

Presentation and Analysis of Product Data: Parent's as Partners Monthly Logs

Parent participation has always been an important part of the Prekindergarten Program. However, since the introduction of this component in 1976-77, the program has had an additional emphasis--parent education. This was the second year that all Title I Prekindergarten buildings participated in this component.

The idea of this program is to provide parents with the skills they need to become directly involved in their child's education. Parents, after all, are their children's primary teachers and in order for early childhood education to be successful, what is learned in school must be reinforced and built upon at home. Parents and other members of the family frequently are quite eager to provide these learning experiences but many lack the necessary skills to do so. They need specific information on how their day-to-day interactions with their children can contribute to their child's development.

The parent program had three main objectives (#14-16):

#14. 60% of the prekindergarten families will participate in the classroom or on field trips four times per year.

#15. 60% of the prekindergarten families will participate at parent meetings four times per year.

#16. 80% of the prekindergarten families will complete with the child nine home activities and return them to school.

Parent meetings were held one Friday each month in two sessions, morning and afternoon. During these meetings, teachers

helped parents make various instructional materials to use with their children at home. They also shared with parents their ideas on how to most effectively work with their children.

The evaluation of this year's program consisted of a year-end analysis of the data collected and recorded during the year. Conversations with teachers and the supervisor indicated that many parents were enthusiastic about attending and participating in the monthly meetings and working with their children at home.

Table 7 below presents a detailed look at how the program fared on each of its three objectives.

TABLE 7. ATTAINMENT OF PRODUCT OBJECTIVES AS DETERMINED BY CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS OF SEPTEMBER TO MAY PARENT AS PARTNERS MONTHLY LOGS.

Obj. No.	Number of Families	Number of Families Meeting Standard	Percent	Objective Attainment
14	421	333	79.1	Yes
15	421	316	75.1	Yes
16	421	282	67.0	No

As the data above indicate, the program had little trouble meeting objectives 14 and 15. On objective 16, the home activities, the percentage meeting the standard fell 6.1 percent, from 73.1 last year to 67.0 this year.

Summary

This year's Title I Prekindergarten Program served approximately 460 children during the course of the year at thirteen elementary schools. A screening test was administered to each registrant in an effort to identify and select the children who most needed prekindergarten experience. Some problems related to advertising for possible participants, managing the screening data, and selecting the most needy pupils were observed this year. In terms of its instructional approach, the program closely followed the Piagetian Theory of child development concentrating on all three domains--cognitive, psychomotor and affective. This year the number of cognitive and psychomotor objectives remained at thirteen as during the 1978-79 school year. Although the affective objectives of previous years were not measured in 1979-80, they were still an important component of the program.

Both process and product evaluations were conducted this year. The process evaluation concentrated on determining whether classroom activities matched those stated in the program proposal, what roles parents and aides conducted in each classroom, and what efforts were made to remedy screening problems observed during the 1978-79 program year. Prekindergarten teachers were observed and were carrying out the prescribed activities. This is noteworthy since a sizable portion of the staff (approximately 40%) was new to the program this year. Parents and aides in the classrooms observed appeared to

have an increased role in the classroom. Little evidence was obtained that teachers were actively involved in recruiting possible additional participants for screening.

The product evaluation, which employed the Prekindergarten S.O.R.T. instrument to measure thirteen of the program's sixteen objectives, found an increase in overall achievement. This year, eleven of the thirteen cognitive and psychomotor objectives (85%) were attained while last year the achievement level was around 76 percent.

Conclusions

The Saginaw Prekindergarten Program was successful. It assisted most of the youngsters who participated in it to attain the majority of the program objectives.

There are some indications that the decline in student performance noted in the past two years may be coming to an end. The responses of teachers to the process questionnaire may provide a partial answer why. The staff generally saw less need for training this year (supposedly their training needs are being better met) and recalled that the program supervisor had been out observing more than the 1978-79 process findings seem to indicate. Maintaining a stable staff in a time of shrinking school enrollments still seems to be a problem which still directly affects the degree to which the delivery system is fully understood and implemented. But aggressive inservice presentation over key aspects of the program and what preschoolers are all about can serve to help the transition of new staff members.

The increases in achievement levels over last year are encouraging. There is however a need for additional coaching and training of new, as well as veteran, prekindergarten teachers. The evaluators believe that the staff is capable of making the necessary adjustments and fully expect the program to attain all its goals in the coming year. The 1979-80 results serve as an indication of the possible further improvements in achievement this coming year.

Finally, additional effort must be extended to use advertising, public relations, and the preschool screening device to identify the most needy pupils for involvement in the program. This area represents a perennial problem that needs some documented action before it can be classified as a problem that defies solution.

Recommendations

The recommendations that follow are based on this year's evaluation and are offered in an attempt to strengthen next year's program.

1. Attention should be paid to the building level achievement data (see Appendix H). The supervisor should work closely with each teacher to determine the reasons for the variations in achievement from school to school. Are the variations due to differences in the way the tests are administered? In instructional approaches and classroom management techniques? Or perhaps some other variables? Answers to these questions could serve as the basis for future inservice sessions.*

---

*The same or similar recommendation was made in the 1978-79 Product Evaluation Report and still is relevant to improving program operations.

2. In light of the errors made in the screening and selection process (failure to select the most needy and failure to screen all pupils selected), it seems necessary to involve the Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research to monitor and refine the entire process.*

3. An increased publicity effort for recruitment and screening of preschoolers is necessary, both this spring and next fall. Documentation of these efforts should be provided to the Evaluation Department so that the questions raised by the State Department of Education can be answered effectively.**

4. The Director of Compensatory Education, the Supervisor of Preschool Education, and the Director of Bilingual Education must formulate a plan to provide a prekindergarten experience for needy bilingual preschoolers using the Office of Bilingual Education as an aid in the publicity for recruitment of all preschoolers in the target area.**

5. The Supervisor of Preschool Education has used the Title I Prekindergarten Supervisor Monitoring Instrument during the latter portion of the 1979-80 school year. This trial use will provide experiences with the instrument that could aid in revising it. Next year it will provide the documentation for the process objective related to the supervisor's role of providing technical assistance and counseling for implementation of the proposed instructional program.**

6. The Supervisor of Preschool Education should seek some means to build upon the present inservice program, such as meeting with the Director of Compensatory Education to formulate indepth inservice plans. These new plans should note teacher suggestions mentioned in the process evaluation data section such as the following: provide more opportunities to make materials during inservice; give knowledge that will be helpful to new and old staff members (either separately or together); show practical applications of Piaget in the classroom; possibly provide inservices

---

*The same or similar recommendation was made in the 1978-79 Product Evaluation Report and still is relevant to improving program operations.

**The same or similar recommendation was made in the process conclusions and recommendation section of this report.

for aides separately; etc. It is important to note that inservice sessions over important curricular concerns of program objectives and behavior modification techniques have been carried out.**

**The same or similar recommendation was made in the process conclusions and recommendation section of this report.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TITLE I PREKINDERGARTEN ACTIVITY
OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

1979-80

Teacher's Name _____ Observer's Name _____

School _____ Date _____ Length of Observation _____

Number preschoolers _____

Product Objective Referent	Type of Activity*	Check if Activity Occurred During Observation Period	
		(√)	Example
	Behavior Modification Techniques**		
	Interest Centers**		
13	Gross Motor Coordination**		
10	Eye-Hand Coordination (Gross and Fine Motor and Manipulative)**		
1	Properties of Objects; i.e., shape, color, hardness (five senses)		

*Refer to ESEA Title I Pre-School Examples of Pre-School Activities Sheet for a detailed explanation of the types of activities.

**These activities plus some aspect of work on physical knowledge should be part of the daily classroom activity.

APPENDIX A

Product Objective Referent	Type of Activity*	Check if Activity Occurred During Observation Period	
		(√)	Example
	Rules of Behavior (school and traffic)		
2	Social Knowledge (i.e., work roles)**		
3	Grouping and Regrouping (i.e., classification)		
4	Transitive Relations (i.e., length, height, weight, shades, hardness)		
	Conservation of Numbers by One-to-One Comparison (i.e., matching, pouring, getting coats, rearranging collections)		
	Topological Space (i.e., in-out, under, etc.)		
	Linear Order (i.e., straight lines, counting)		
	Parts of a Whole		
12	Copying Specific Shapes (i.e., cutting, pantomine, drawing)		

*Refer to ESEA Title I Pre-School Examples of Pre-School Activities Sheet for a detailed explanation of the types of activities.

**These activities plus some aspect of work on physical knowledge should be part of the daily classroom activity.

APPENDIX A

Product Objective Referent	Type of Activity*	Check if Activity Occurred During Observation Period	
		(√)	Example
11	Temporal Ordering of Events		
	Use of Body to Represent an Object		
	Use of Objects to Represent Other Objects		
	Human Utterance Which Represent Objects		
	Use of Three-Dimensional Model to Represent Object		
	Two-Dimensional Representation of Objects in Drawing		
14-16	Record of Parental Participation Being Maintained		

*Refer to ESEA Title I Pre-School Examples of Pre-School Activities Sheet for a detailed explanation of the types of activities.

APPENDIX A

1. If parents are in the classroom during your observation, what role(s) do they play?

2. Describe general tasks (e.g., maker of materials, tutor, teacher, etc.) that aide provide during the observation.

3. What specific efforts, if any, were made this fall to screen larger numbers of possible preschool participants?

4. What specific efforts, if any, were made this fall to screen potential bilingual participants?

APPENDIX A

(Key for Classroom Activity Observation Checklist)

ESEA TITLE I - PRE-SCHOOL

Examples of Pre-School Activities According to Product and Process Objectives

Type of Activity	Activity Examples	
Behavior Modification	-One-to-one relationship with an adult -Seeking adults as resources -Consistent classroom environment--inner control--freedom and responsibility -Sharing, selecting partners, initiating activities with others -Positive reinforcement -Continue with a task -Exhibit curiosity, questions, explore, experiment -Creativity--different ways to approach a task	
Gross Motor Coordination (large body movements, climbing, walking, rolling)	-Rhythms -Dancing -Jungle Gym -Free play activities -Balance Beam -Mats - tumbling -Play All Equipment -Jumpin Jiminy -Jump Roles - forming circles with activities -Jumping Jacks -Duck Duck Goose -Squirrel in Tree	-Johnny Works With One Hammer -Bear Hunt -Acting out Mother Goose Rhyme -Rhythm Estamae -Dodge Ball -Balls & Skate Board -Play House -Roller Skates -Snowman Activities -Up the Steps
Fine Motor Activities--Eye-Hand Coordination (use of classroom tools and materials--cutting, pasting, tearing)	-Art work -Writing on the board -Finger painting -Folding -Stirring pudding -Peg boards -Pouring -Geoboards -Puzzles -Cuisenairre Rods -Sorting beads and buttons -TRY -Building Blocks -Lacing	-Weaving -Chalk Boards -Flannel Boards -Clay -Sand box -Water play -Spreading peanut butter -Coats - buttons and zippers -Clean up time -Finger plays -Using musical instruments

(continue)

APPENDIX A

(ESEA TITLE I - PRE-SCHOOL continued)

Type of Activity	Activity Examples	
Properties of and Appropriate Behavior for Exploring Properties of an Object (shape, color, hardness--using the five senses. Changing shades, measuring, weighing)	-Making apple sauce, soups, cookies, etc. -Smelling and handling fruits and vegetables -Sawing wood -Tinkertoys -Sand paper activities -Feeling activities -Snacks - (mixtures) -Snow experiments -Bubble blowing -Straw painting -Furry and other textured toys -Fast and slow inclined plane -Paper mache	-Growing plants from seed -Cutting -Freezing -Heating -Rolling -Twisting -Frosting -Jello -Butter -Cakes -Paint mixing -Sinking and floating -Color macaroni -Play dough
Knowledge of Rules that Apply to Learners, i.e., health, and safety	-Stories -Visitors - nurse -Health Lessons	-Safety Lessons -Line-up activities -Taking turns
Social Knowledge (world of work and roles of workers)	-Books -Field Trips -Films -Visitors -Role-playing -Helpers in the room	-Community workers -School workers -Visiting patrolmen -Postman -Kandy Keg Field Trip
One Criterion Classification, Shifting to a second criterion among an array of objects (grouping shifting from one criterion to another)	-Color - blocks -Shape -Size -Texture -Tone -Utility -Smell -Taste -Calendar	-Sorting -Attendance - number of girls -Attendance - number of boys -Putting toys away -Doll House -Doll Dishes

(continue)

Type of Activity	Activity Examples	
Relations Among Transitive Relationships (seriation--comparing and arranging things according to a given dimension by transitive relations)	-Length -Height -Weight -Shades of color -Hardness -Softness -Cuisennaire rods -Block tower building -Texture activities	
Convervation of Number by One-to-One Comparison (gross comparison between collections; comparisons by one-to-one correspondence)	-Collections - rearrangement of -Lunch activities -Setting table -Matching -Calendar -Passing anything -Weather	-Getting coats -Right boot -Pouring activities
Topological Space (meaning of in-out, over-under, in front of, in back of, in relation to self, toys, pictures)	-Ring Around the Rosies -Squirrel in a Tree -Hokey Pokey -When You're Up Your Up -In and Out the Windows -Bear Hunt	-Directions from adult -Three Billy Goats Gruff -Jack in the Box -London Bridge -Popcorn -Use of box
Topological Relationships Concerning Linear Order (structure of space)	-Games - straight line -Role-playing -Manipulation of Object (rods, blocks, toys) -Poetry -Prose	-Counting days till -Finger plays -Bear Hunt -AAA -Ten Little Indians
Parts of a Whole	-Clay -Paper cutting -Puzzles - inlaid -Coloring -Sawing -Cooking -Body Parts -Growing plants -Filling partial measurements	-Gingerbread Man -Bread and rolls -Strawberry jam -Ripping cloth strips -Torn paper artwork -Loops - artwork -Placement of toys in specific unit or box

(continued)

APPENDIX A

(ESEA TITLE I - PRE-SCHOOL continued)

Type of Activity	Activity Samples	
Copying of Specific Shapes	-Line drawings -Sand drawing -Paper cutting -Cookie cutting with clay -"Simon Says" -Tracing -Rubbing -Pegboard	-Geoboards -TRY -Writing chalkboard -Directed copying activity -Pantomine -Exercises
Temporal Ordering of Three or Four Events (structuring time)	-Show and Tell -Story - book -Role-playing -Science experiments -Calendar -Preparation art, lunch, cleanup home bound	-Growth stages -Finger play -Farmer in Dell -Audio-visual materials
Use of Body to Represent Objects (i.e., pretending to hold a telephone receiver)	-Musical games -Role-playing -Shadow Plays -Dramatization -Elephant Walk	-Seals -Bunny Hop -Exercise Records -Bodies for race cars
Use of Objects to Represent Other Objects (props) (representation at symbol level)	-Story telling by using props -Role-playing -Puppets -Flannel Board	
Uttering of Sounds to Represent Objects	-Role-playing -Musical game -Puppets	-Flannel board -Dramatization
Use of Three-Dimensional Models to Represent Objects (representation at symbol level)	-Pretend telephone -Playing house -Using blocks -Buggy for cars	-Educubes for drums -Domino blocks for walkie talkie
Two-Dimensional Representation of Objects in Drawings (eye-hand manipulation)	-Read aloud of picture story book -Manipulation of packets of cards which contain pictures of common objects -Drawing on chalkboard, easel, coloring paper -Play with water and brush, pitcher, or sprinkling can -Play teacher	

APPENDIX B

PREKINDERGARTEN PROCESS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1979-80

SCHOOL _____

DIRECTIONS: Answer the questions below. Please return the completed questionnaire by February 15, 1980, to Richard Claus through inter-office mail.

1. Describe a typical daily classroom schedule for your prekindergarten program. More specifically, what major types of activities do you attempt to provide for daily.

2. Describe how you use "behavior modification" techniques in your classroom. What specific behaviors are you trying to change through these techniques?

3. Do you presently have a Peabody Kit to use in your classroom?

____ Yes If so, how do you use it? Probe for any suggestions or materials provided for its use.

____ No

4. What steps, if any, have you taken to provide for language development in your classroom?

5. Are you presently lacking basic instructional materials and/or equipment to operate the prekindergarten program?

____ Yes What materials and/or equipment?

_____

_____

_____

_____

____ No

6. How many times has the program supervisor observed your classroom this school year?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. In which areas do you feel you need more training? (circle)

1. Prekindergarten philosophy
2. Program's objectives
3. Piaget theory
4. Practical application of Piaget in the classroom
5. Expressive language techniques
6. Classroom management
7. Materials development
8. Parenting
9. Peabody Kit
10. Other (specify) _____

8. What steps, if any, could be taken to improve the inservice sessions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. What steps, if any, could be taken to improve the parenting component?

10. What other comments and concerns do you have regarding this year's prekindergarten program?

APPENDIX C

SAGINAW NEWS ARTICLE ABOUT TITLE I PRESCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF AUGUST 27, 1979.

City school registration continues this week

Registrations for children who will attend Saginaw public schools for the first time are being accepted this week at the district's elementary schools. Classes begin Sept. 4.

To register a child for kindergarten or as a new enrollee, parents or guardians must take copies of the youngster's birth certificate and immunization record to the school nearest the child's home.

Children 5 years old by Dec. 1 of this year are eligible to begin kindergarten in September.

Federally funded pre-kindergarten programs are also open for registration, but because preschool enrollment is limited, students who register for these programs are screened to determine those most needy.

Pre-kindergarten programs operate at Edith Baillie, Coulter, Emerson, Heavenrich, Houghton, Nelle Haley, Longfellow, Loomis, Morley, Potter, Rouse and Salina elementary schools.

Students living in the Webber Elementary School area are also eligible and may register at Webber, although space has not yet been confirmed for the program in that building.

Children who live in the attendance areas of the pre-kindergarten schools are eligible if their birth dates fall between Dec. 2, 1974, and Dec. 1, 1975.

Copies of a child's birth certificate and health records are also required for registration in the pre-kindergarten programs.

APPENDIX D

1979-80 TITLE I PREKINDERGARTEN OBJECTIVES

1. Physical Knowledge

   80% of the pupils will demonstrate properties of and display appropriate behavior for exploring properties of objects by correctly responding to 2 of 3 items related.

2. Social Knowledge

   80% of the pupils will demonstrate knowledge of social roles by correctly responding to at least three of four items related to objective 2.

3. Knowledge: Classification

   50% of the pupils will successfully apply two criteria for sorting: color and/or form.

4. Knowledge: Logical-Mathematical-Seriation

   70% of the pupils will compare and arrange objects according to a given dimension by coordinating transitive relationships of at least one of two items of this objective.

5. Spatio-Temporal Knowledge: Structuring of Time

   50% of the pupils will respond correctly to at least 50% of the items related to temporal ordering of events.

6. Expressive Language: Labeling

   85% of the pupils will label at least four objects in the birthday party picture.

7. Expressive Language: Syntax

   80% of the pupils will use sentences of at least five words to describe the birthday party picture.

8. Expressive Language: Fluency

   65% of the pupils will use at least three of five elements of fluency in their description of the birthday party picture.

9. Expressive Language: Plot Extension

   50% of the pupils will use at least one element of plot extension in their description of the birthday party picture.

10. Fine Motor Coordination

    80% of the pupils will successfully perform at least three of four activities involving hand/eye coordination.

APPENDIX D

11. Spatiotemporal Knowledge: Structuring of Space (order)

65% of the pupils will correctly respond to topological relationships of order or pattern.

12. Representation at the Symbol Level: Specific Shapes

65% of the pupils will copy successfully three of four shapes.

13. Gross Motor Coordination

80% of pupils will successfully complete at least three of four large movements of the body.

14. Parent Participation

60% of the adult members of the prekindergarten family will participate in school activities at least four times per year.

15. Parent Education Program: Friday Meetings

60% of the adult members of the prekindergarten family will participate in at least four friday meetings.

16. Parent Education Program: Home Work Activities

80% of the adult members of the prekindergarten family will complete at least nine prekindergarten home activities and return them to school.

APPENDIX E

INSERVICE AGENDA

Longfellow School

September 20, 1979

Prekindergarten Teachers

8:10	-	Coffee and Donuts
8:20	-	Get Acquainted Games
8:45	-	Welcome and Overview Program and Procedures
9:30	-	Health Records - Immunization - School Nurse
10:30	-	Screening Test Demonstration Four-Year-Old - Marilyn Porras
11:00	-	Screening Do's and Don'ts - Mim Sweigart Preparation and Purpose Utilization of Aides
11:30 - 12:30	-	Lunch
12:30	-	After Screening - Then What? - Mim Organization For Home Visits Five "P's" to Successful Home Vists - Overhead Presentat - Marilyn Porras and Miriam Sweigart -
2:00	-	Role Play - Home Visits - Marilyn Porras and Miriam Sweigart -
2:30	-	Discussion and Wrap-up - Reva -

cc: Richard Claus
Jerome Tillman
Jean Grey

APPENDIX E

INSERVICE AGENDA

Houghton School

September 21, 1979

New 1979-80 Prekindergarten Teachers

8:10	Coffee and Donuts
8:30	Open Discussion of Individual Needs and Concerns - Mim Sweigart and Marilyn Porras -
	Ordering Supplies Prekindergarten Objectives and Strategies Lesson Planning Inservice Requests
10:30	Parent Program Objectives - Mim Sweigart - Ways of Relating to Parents - Marilyn Porras
11:30 - 12:30	Lunch
12:45	Pre-Meeting Preparation - Miriam Sweigart
1:15	First Parent Meeting - Marilyn Porras
1:45	Discussion
2:00	October Parent Meeting - Marilyn Porras and Rosemary Taft
	October Packet Organization Parent-Child Learning Center
2:45	Wrap-up

cc: Richard Claus
Jerome Tillman
Jean Grey

APPENDIX F

TO: Reva Ruby, Houghton Resource Center
Susan Endstrasser, Longfellow
Cynthia Marcoux, J. Rouse
Viola Ramseyer, Houghton

FROM: Richard Claus RC

RE: Prekindergarten Inservice Session of October 5, 1979, on Classroom Management of Emotional Problems

DATE: November 12, 1979

N = 9

Results

Eight of the nine respondents (89%) gained information that would help them in their work. The one remairing respondent failed to answer the question. From other open-ended questions it was evident that approximately half (45%) felt that more information on the same topic should be presented.

Ability to Meet Staff Expectations

When asked whether they had prior expectations concerning this inservice, three of the nine respondents (33%) answered in the affirmative. All three of these people with prior expectations thought the inservice addressed their concerns adequately.

Overall Assessment of the Inservice

When asked to rate the overall quality of the session on a five point scale from "very poor" to "very good," all respondents rated the session as "very good."

Learnings Cited by Staff

--How to handle emotional problems using family therapy techniques. (4)
--Classroom management techniques. (1)
--Developmental stages of children. (1)
--Students receive non-verbal messages from teachers and parents. (1)
--Characteristics of the student population. (1)

RC/tf

cc: Barry Quimper

APPENDIX F

TO: Reva Ruby, Houghton Resource Center
Susan Endstrasser, Longfellow
Cynthia Marcoux, J. Rouse
Viola Ramseyer, Houghton

FROM: Richard Claus RC

RE: Prekindergarten Inservice Session of November 2, 1979 on Development of Manipulative and Language Activities (a.m.) and Prekindergarten S.O.R.T. (p.m.)

DATE: November 12, 1979

N = 4

Results

All four of the respondents (100%) gained information that would help them in their work. One respondent thought that a session on time management would be an useful topic for an upcoming inservice.

Ability to Meet Staff Expectations

When asked whether they had prior expectations concerning this inservice, all four of the respondents answered in the affirmative.

Overall Assessment of the Inservice

When asked to rate the overall quality of the session on a five point scale from "very poor" to "very good," the polled respondents rated it either "good" or "very good" (50% each).

Learnings Cited by Staff

--Prekindergarten S.O.R.T. testing procedures. (2)
--Scheduling of materials during classroom sessions. (2)
--Ideas for language development. (1)

RC/tf

cc: Barry Quimper

APPENDIX G

TITLE I PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

Staff Inservice Evaluation Form

Date: _____

DIRECTIONS: Please complete this form after the inservice and return to Richard Claus at the Evaluation Department through inter-office mail.

1. Did you have any prior expections regarding this inservice?

   Yes ___ What were they? _____

   No ___

2. In what activities did you participate?

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. What did you learn from this activity?

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. Will the information gained help you in your work?

   Yes ___ How? _____

   No ___ Why not? _____

5. Did the inservice meet your expectations?

   Yes ___

   No ___ Why not? _____

6. Is there other information which would be useful to you?

   Yes ___ What? _____

   No ___

7. Circle the descriptor which best describes the quality of the overall session.

Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good

8. Additional Comments: _____

PERCENT OF STUDENTS ATTAINING MASTERY BY BUILDING AND OBJECTIVE

School	OBJECTIVE NUMBER												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Baillie	100.0	92.0	64.0	72.0	84.0	96.0	72.0	28.0	92.0	96.0	84.0	36.0	92.0
Coulter	100.0	96.8	87.1	93.5	90.3	100.0	96.8	83.9	100.0	100.0	87.1	90.3	96.8
Emerson	96.9	93.8	37.5	59.4	93.8	100.0	87.5	56.3	87.5	56.3	40.6	62.5	100.0
Haley	85.3	100.0	88.2	23.5	88.2	97.1	67.6	50.0	97.1	94.1	52.9	44.1	82.3
Heavenrich	93.5	83.9	61.3	67.7	87.1	96.8	80.6	35.5	87.1	96.8	64.5	80.6	93.5
Houghton	97.3	100.0	94.6	86.5	73.0	100.0	94.6	89.2	97.3	100.0	94.6	83.8	100.0
Jones	85.7	94.3	94.3	97.1	85.7	91.4	91.4	40.0	34.3	91.4	100.0	62.9	100.0
Longfellow	91.7	94.4	91.7	94.4	83.3	75.0	44.4	36.1	63.9	97.2	83.3	41.7	86.1
Loomis	97.1	85.7	65.7	82.8	85.7	94.3	62.9	34.3	91.4	88.6	77.1	62.9	97.1
Morley	96.1	92.3	73.1	76.9	88.5	92.3	84.6	65.4	88.5	88.5	76.9	69.2	96.1
Potter	100.0	94.1	70.6	94.1	94.1	100.0	52.9	35.3	64.7	100.0	88.2	82.3	94.1
Rouse	94.7	81.6	60.5	76.3	68.4	89.5	60.5	31.6	89.5	92.1	63.1	65.8	89.5
Salina	88.9	100.0	66.7	83.3	44.4	94.4	94.4	44.4	94.4	61.1	50.0	72.2	8 .3

APPENDIX I

TO: Reva Ruby

FROM: Richard Claus

RE: Title I preschoolers who participated in this year's program, but were not screened

DATE: May 16, 1980

Listed below are the names of the prekindergarteners who were not screened at program sites as of latest class list.

Baillie

1. Murray, Arthur
2. Briggs, Benny
3. Roger, Derrick

Coulter

1. Dillard, Shnecia
2. O'Deay, James

Emerson

1. Collins, Shatell

Jones

1. Hill, Charlotte
2. Morales, Ruth

Longfellow

1. Garcia, Neva
2. Willingham, LaDawn
3. Brown, Oraccicus
4. Clarke, Jamaal
5. Smith, Deaudnea
6. Vail, Cawanda
7. Watson, Catrina
8. Walker, Earma

Loomis

1. Myles, Ligaya
2. Olivarez, Rosemary

Morley

1. Carter, Christina

Potter

1. Helton, Demona
2. Merrill, Renisha

J. Rouse

1. Johnson, Dontarrie
2. Taylor, Maurice

RC/tlf

cc: Barry Quimper